

Date: Mon, 17 May 93 18:51:19 PDT  
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>  
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu  
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu  
Precedence: Bulk  
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V93 #148  
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest                      Mon, 17 May 93                      Volume 93 : Issue    148

Today's Topics:

                    More on no-code  
          Morse et cetera... (4 msgs)  
                    no-code defense  
          No-Code Stupidity (3 msgs)  
                    RE: sick of it all  
                    Type certification

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>  
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>  
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available  
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text  
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official  
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

-----

Date: Mon, 17 May 1993 20:32:59 GMT  
From: usc!howland.reston.ans.net!agate!news.ucdavis.edu!othello.ucdavis.edu!  
ez006683@network.UCSD.EDU  
Subject: More on no-code  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

paulf@umunhum.stanford.edu (Paul Flaherty) writes:  
: In article <C75F8n.H1x@ucdavis.edu> ez006683@othello.ucdavis.edu (Daniel D.  
Todd) writes:  
: >Perhaps in other services but not in the amateur service.  
:  
: The Communications Act of 1934 and its amendments apply to all the services  
: under the auspices of the FCC.

Perhaps I am confused here. Part 97 strongly implies that there is a  
distinct advantage to having more rather than less amateurs in the US.  
And the Comms. Act of 1934 say that it is the FCC's duty to limit the

number of stations on the air. Well I suppose it comes down to which document you want to put more emphasis on. I would like to see the service include as many people as possible. You on the other hand do not want to have to wait for any length of time to access any frequency of your choosing.

: >They don't even license stations in the amateur service anymore, let alone  
: > transmitters.  
:  
: While the FCC no longer requests or prints a station address, the license  
: still consists of an operator license, and a station license. The callsign,  
: in fact, is associated with the station, not the operator.

You are right. It does still seem rather strange that the FCC no longer issues separate station licenses. In actuality I suppose that the individual hams actually license the stations because they control the use of their individual station license. They can apply the station license to any transmitter the emissions of which they are willing to take responsibility for. These are all really just exercises in semantics. The fact is that the FCC doesn't care from what physical location or radio gear an amateur uses as long as s/he operates within the limits of their license.

:>In fact transmitters don't even have to be type certified much less  
:>individually licensed.  
: Actually, yes, transmitters sold by vendors must meet certain requirements  
: which are not in Part 97, which apply to all transmitting equipment sold in  
: the US. Even for homebrew, however, technical standards do exist in Part 97.

I am aware that MANUFACTURERS are required to obtain type certification for transmitters etc. I am also aware that there is no requirement for type certification of transmitters USED in the amateur service. Technical standards are not the same as certification. [I do have some questions about type certification though]

: : >Advantage: Will bring more individuals interested in promoting the goals  
: >of amateur radio into the hobby. For a list of the goals of amateur radio  
: >see part 97.1  
:  
: Given that this is already happening, your advantage is not unique. This is  
: the reason for having a codeless introductory license.

I said MORE that meant more than the current structure. I can't believe that the current system brings in more amateurs than the current system :)

: : >Disadvantage: Since the one you mentioned isn't valid I'll pick my own.  
:  
: Elaborate. How have you shown that removing the requirement won't lead to

: overcrowding of the HF bands, and result in interference?

I didn't show/say that changing the structure would not increase the use of HF spectrum. I merely pointed out that it is not important because part of the charter for the amateur service isto INCREASE the number of hams not limit it. In short, more crowded bands are an acceptable side effect to obtaining the goals of the service.

: >The inclusion of a CW exam for upgrading one's license brings  
: >proportionally more individuals with disregard for the rules into hamdom.  
:  
: Now, we had agreed that CW or lack thereof has no bearing on character.  
: Would you now like to reopen that discussion?

Nope I'm happy to leave it closed.

:  
: >And I've just layed a purple egg, right?!?!? No, they are at some times  
: >and not at others. That's as silly as saying that since 2m in the  
: >Sacramento Valley is dead most of the time. Most repeaters are  
: >transmitting less than 3 hours a day. (example don't ask for citation)  
:  
: W're in absolute agreement here; the VHF and UHF spectra are underutilized.  
: Thus, some move to increase growth was warrented, namely the codeless  
: introductory level license. But \*none\* of this applies to HF.  
:  
: >That the no codes use less spectrum.  
:  
: Narrowband FM occuppies from 15-20 kHz depending on deviation. CW is nominally  
: less than 100 Hz wide. You're off by a few orders of magnitude.  
:  
: >Hopefully the result would be the development of more efficient modes.  
:  
: You havn't shown why that cannot take place now, nor have you shown that it  
: \*isn't\*. CLOVER, for example, was developed under the current rules, and  
: is probably as close to the Shannon bound as we are likely to see for  
: some time.  
:  
: >The reason voice is used so often is the effective use of time per unit of  
: >information.  
:  
: As I've said before, amateur message length is not transmission time  
: independent.

Please explain this. I've heard this same point before but it never did make any sense to me. I personally have a certain amount of information I want to transfer. If I want to talk aboutthe fact that my girlfriends softball team just earned a berth in the Div II National Tournament then

I'm gonna do it whether I'm on ssb, fm, packet, cw or the internet :-)

: >An overcrowded movie theatre causes interference?  
: >I guess I'll let that one go.  
:  
: It sure does if there's a fire. Mob panic is not pretty.  
Guess I'll get that fire extinguisher back out. :-)

Dan

```
--
*-----*
* Daniel D. Todd      Packet: KC6UUD@WA6RDH.#nocal.ca.usa      *
*                    Internet: DDTODD@ucdavis.edu              *
*                    Snail Mail: 1750 Hanover #102              *
*                    Davis CA 95616                            *
*-----*
*      I do not speak for the University of California....    *
*      and it sure as hell doesn't speak for me!!            *
*-----*
```

-----  
Date: Mon, 17 May 1993 22:48:10 GMT  
From: pa.dec.com!nntpd2.cxo.dec.com!nuts2u.enet.dec.com!little@decwrl.dec.com  
Subject: Morse et cetera...  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

I love it. Same drive1 under a different subject line.

To those bashing the advocates of change, check the license class of those advocating the change. I don't like the current license structure and I'm not a no-code technician. I was, but I upgraded. A number of those seeking change are extra class licensees. But I guess they're just whining too instead of making the effort to upgrade. To what class license should they upgrade?

As to robert@amanda.jpunix.com (robert)'s comment:

>I would be very interested in knowing what class of amateur license YOU  
>have, Dan. Rather than constantly complain about how unfair the current  
>licensing structure is, wouldn't it be easier (and more productive) for  
>you to simply upgrade through the amateur ranks? Wait...that's unfair  
>too, isn't it. It requires EFFORT.

Is this the "my license is bigger than your license" argument? Quit yer whining and help define exams that are relevant and useful and require

EFFORT. Or is that TOO HARD for you?

73,  
Todd  
N9MWB

-----  
Date: Mon, 17 May 93 14:39:14 CDT  
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!  
zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!menudo.uh.edu!jpunix!unkaphaed!amanda!  
robert@network.UCSD.EDU  
Subject: Morse et cetera...  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

ez006683@othello.ucdavis.edu (Daniel D. Todd) writes:

> robert@amanda.jpunix.com (robert) writes:  
> : >  
> : I would be very interested in knowing what class of amateur license YOU  
> : have, Dan. Rather than constantly complain about how unfair the current  
> : licensing structure is, wouldn't it be easier (and more productive) for  
> : you to simply upgrade through the amateur ranks? Wait...that's unfair  
> : too, isn't it. It requires EFFORT.  
> :  
> : --Robert  
>  
> Easier, yes, more productive, no! Why does my license class make a  
> difference in whether or not my opinion on the current license structure  
> is the best we could construct? MY opinions are not dictated by my  
> license class. That is like saying that a man has no reason to be  
> interested in sexual equality or a whiteperson shouldn't care about race  
> relations. This is not PC drive! these things are my beliefs. I would  
> not be served by increasing the access to HF for technicians since I have  
> no access to an HF rig (or more accurately antenna) at this time. What  
> I'm trying to get you to understand is that whether I am a no-coder or an  
> extra my beliefs would npt be any different.  
>  
> Dan  
> --

Your license class makes a big difference, Dan. If you are an Extra, then your arguement has credibility. If you are a Technician, then in the eyes of the group you are whining. I'm sorry, Dan, but I just don't buy it. I'll make a wager with you. Upgrade through the amateur ranks to Extra. It's not difficult, but be advised that it does take effort. When you have accomplished that, let me know what your opinion on the subject at hand is. I predict either one of two things will occur: you will upgrade,

and your opinion will change, or you will never upgrade, and continue to whine.

Have a nice day.

--Robert

-----  
Date: Mon, 17 May 93 05:13:22 GMT  
From: csus.edu!netcom.com!netcomsv!orchard.la.locus.com!prodnet.la.locus.com!  
pleione.la.locus.com!dana@decwrl.dec.com  
Subject: Morse et cetera...  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <9Tmm4B1w165w@amanda.jpunix.com> robert@amanda.jpunix.com (robert) writes:

>system@garlic.sbs.com (Tony Pelliccio) writes:

>

>> robert@amanda.jpunix.com (robert) writes:

>>

>> > Isn't it funny how this has degenerated to a code versus no-code debate?

>> > I mean, come on now, folks. We now have a no-code license (Codeless

>> > Technician), and those who can't or won't learn to code now have a door

>> > in which to enter the hobby. So, it seems to me to be a moot point.

>> >

>> > --Robert WA3J

>>

>> But it's not a moot point when no-code techs who don't want to learn the

>> code scream and bitch about not having access to the HF bands. That's

>> the real issue.

>>

>> Tony

>

>You know, Tony, I'm sick of listening to that crap. If they can't live

>with a Codeless Tech license, or can't upgrade beyond that, my advice is

>to go find another hobby. Upgrading is not a difficult task, but it does

>require effort. Should we lower the standards (which has already been

>done on more than one occasion within the last few years) because a

>small percentage of licensees (or potential licensees) are too lazy or

>ignorant to master the code? I'm sorry, but I just don't buy that.

>

While non-coded Techs may be complaining about the lack of HF privs, I have yet to hear it. I'm not in favor of eliminating the 5 WPM CW test; I'm in favor of eliminating (or providing sensible alternatives to) the 13 and 20 WPM tests, since it appears that the utility of higher speed CW operators is now obsolete.

Of course, now we have Tony and Robert crowing about lowered standards and all the other ills in society. Maybe lowered standards are a bad idea; look what happened at SBS....

--

\* Dana H. Myers KK6JQ | Views expressed here are \*  
\* (310) 337-5136 | mine and do not necessarily \*  
\* dana@locus.com DoD #466 | reflect those of my employer  
\*  
\* This Extra supports the abolition of the 13 and 20 WPM tests \*

-----  
Date: Tue, 18 May 1993 02:28:26 GMT  
From: pa.dec.com!nntpd2.cxo.dec.com!nuts2u.enet.dec.com!little@decwrl.dec.com  
Subject: Morse et cetera...  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

robert@amanda.jpunix.com (robert) writes:

>Your license class makes a big difference, Dan. If you are an Extra, then  
>your argument has credibility. If you are a Technician, then in the eyes  
>of the group you are whining. I'm sorry, Dan, but I just don't buy it.  
>I'll make a wager with you. Upgrade through the amateur ranks to Extra.  
>It's not difficult, but be advised that it does take effort. When you  
>have accomplished that, let me know what your opinion on the subject at  
>hand is. I predict either one of two things will occur: you will upgrade,  
>and your opinion will change, or you will never upgrade, and continue  
>to whine.

Hahahahahaha, can I quote you on that? You're suggesting that learning Morse code at 20 WPM will somehow change his opinion. Your convictions must be pretty weak if memorizing some encoding scheme changes them. If memorizing the ASCII table was required to get a BSCS would your opinion of that requirement change after "making the effort"?

By the way, I think Dan already has upgraded to extra. I'll be advanced shortly and my opinion certainly isn't going to change based upon memorizing -- --- -. ... . -.-. --- -.. . Most of the other proponents of change are advanced or extra. I guess they just haven't been given enough time to change their minds now that they've been enlightened.

73,  
Todd  
N9MWB

-----  
Date: Mon, 17 May 1993 22:48:52 GMT  
From: pa.dec.com!nntpd2.cxo.dec.com!nuts2u.enet.dec.com!little@decwrl.dec.com  
Subject: no-code defense  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

system@mooch.sbs.com (Christopher Ogren) writes:

>If that is not the truth...what is? Put an ounce of effort into morse  
>code and you'd have it licked. But it is easier for you to complain.  
>Again I realize that some people believe the LCD is what this hobby  
>needs. What this hobby needs is capable amateurs not people who need an  
>excuse for why they can't GET something. It's called work people.

Naw, if we stooped to the LCD in this hobby, we'd all have to get sbs  
accounts. I was hoping we could come up with a scheme where we'd limit the  
extra class licenses to operate only in the extra portions of the bands.  
That way the majority of hams wouldn't have to put up with their incessant  
whining about the good old days, CB transplants, their latest bowel  
movement, and how great incentive licensing is. ;-) You guys are the  
greatest incentive I can think of to \*not\* upgrade (at least not to extra.)

73,  
Todd  
N9MWB

-----  
Date: Mon, 17 May 93 19:58:17 GMT  
From: mvb.saic.com!unogate!news.service.uci.edu!usc!howland.reston.ans.net!  
noc.near.net!oz.plymouth.edu!r\_fussel@network.UCSD.EDU  
Subject: No-Code Stupidity  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1993May16.214331.20770@anomaly.sbs.com> wr1r@anomaly.sbs.com (Frank  
Almeida (WR1R)) writes:

>I'm pretty new to this whole bunch of discussion about code versus no-code.  
>You people should get a life, learning code has been around for a long  
>time and if I had to learn it to 20 words per minute then you're going  
>to have to learn it to 20 words too.

>

>I also support beefing up the theory to keep the CB transplants out  
>of the bands (you know, the ones with their callsigns on their belt buckles and  
the ones who ground their equipment to a gas pipe).

>

>Flame away -- I love hatemail.

No flames here, I agree with you totally. I have my advanced licence, and I got it freshman year in high school. I also got my first ticket in 7th grade. Now if I have the motivation to learn code in 7th grade, then so can anyone else, no matter what age. Code requirements are great to keep our bands from turning into 11 meters.

Ron Fussell  
N1HIB

-----  
Date: 17 May 93 23:41:58 GMT  
From: pa.dec.com!nntpd2.cxo.dec.com!nuts2u.enet.dec.com!little@decwrl.dec.com  
Subject: No-Code Stupidity  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

r\_fussell@oz.plymouth.edu (Ronald D. Fussell) writes:

>In article <1993May16.214331.20770@anomaly.sbs.com> wr1r@anomaly.sbs.com (Frank Almeida (WR1R)) wri>>I'm pretty new to this whole bunch of discussion about code versus no-code.

>>You people should get a life, learning code has been around for a long  
>>time and if I had to learn it to 20 words per minute then you're going  
>>to have to learn it to 20 words too.

>>

>>I also support beefing up the theory to keep the CB transplants out  
>>of the bands (you know, the ones with their call signs on their belt buckles  
>>and the ones who ground their equipment to a gas pipe).

>>

>>Flame away -- I love hatemail.

>

> No flames here, I agree[sic] with you totally. I have my advanced  
>licence[sic], and I got it freshman year in high school. I also got my  
>first ticket in 7th grade. Now if I have the motivation to learn code  
>in 7th grade, then so can anyone else, no matter what age. Code  
>requirements are great to keep our bands from turning into 11 meters.

You guys are pretty funny. With all this talk about CB transplants and 11 meters, you'd think that amateurs were somehow different than the rest of the populace. I guess that happens when you think you're so much better than another group of people.

In any case, what I've heard on CB sounds very similar to what I hear on several amateur HF bands from stations with valid licenses. Or is all the garbage on 20 and 75 meters coming from bootleggers? How does the behavior of DXers when the bands are in poor shape or contesters on contest weekends differ from the CBers turning on their linear to walk over nearby conversations? Or is the same behavior acceptable on the amateur bands

because those stations are "licensed" and legal while the CBers aren't.

As you said, get a life (before you fall off your pedestal or pass out due to lack of oxygen.)

73,  
Todd  
N9MWB

-----  
Date: 17 May 93 23:00:05 GMT  
From: ogicse!uwm.edu!ux1.cso.uiuc.edu!howland.reston.ans.net!noc.near.net!  
oz.plymouth.edu!r\_fussel@network.UCSD.EDU  
Subject: No-Code Stupidity  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1993May17.214208.22929@nntpd2.cxo.dec.com> little@nuts2u.enet.dec.com  
(nuts2u::little) writes:

[parts of a pointless rebuttal deleted]

>garbage on 20 and 75 meters coming from bootleggers? How does the behavior  
>of DXers when the bands are in poor shape or testers on contest weekends  
>differ from the CBers turning on their linear to walk over nearby  
>conversations? Or is the same behavior acceptable on the amateur bands  
>because those stations are "licensed" and legal while the CBers aren't.

Well, that one is easy, CBers crank their linears and walk over the other stations to piss people off. Generally, this is considered rude and offensive. On the other hand, when the bands are in poor shape, or when a contest is taking place, the extra power is needed to get the job done. Of course there are the unfortunate who are limited with their equipment, but that's their problem. I don't have a linear, and I only run 100 watts, tops. You don't hear me complaining. Let's face it, there's a little bit of a difference between talking to your buddy accross the street, and working a rare station in some obscure part of the world. Please reconsider your argument.

Flames are welcome...

Ron  
N1HIB

--  
-----

Date: Mon, 17 May 1993 22:48:19 GMT

From: pa.dec.com!nntpd2.cxo.dec.com!nuts2u.enet.dec.com!little@decwrl.dec.com

Subject: RE: sick of it all

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

system@mooch.sbs.com (Christopher Ogren) writes:

>little@nuts2u.enet.dec.com (nuts2u::little) writes:

>

>> Granting access to portions of the phone bands to someone because they can

>> copy 20 WPM instead of 13 WPM or 13 WPM instead of 5 WPM seems a bit

>> bizarre.

>

>Maybe it's bizarre to someone who whines about how difficult the code

>is. The extra portion of the bands should be reserved for amateurs with

>reasonable technical[sic] and morse code prowess. If all the opponents of

>code put the effort they extole[sic] about fighting the code requirment[sic] into

>learing[sic] the code they'd be all set. Just get it done! Stop whining!

>Extra class amateur radio operators are supposed to "excel" in the radio

>art. Stop trying to water the hobby down. The lowest common

>denominator seems to be your goal.

Nice attempt at twisting the argument around, but even the most casual reader isn't likely to be fooled. This isn't \*about\* how easy or difficult the Morse code exams are, it's about making the exams and licenses relevant to the privileges granted. Please explain how copying 5, 13, or 20 WPM is related to the privilege granted for those exams.

No one is trying to water the hobby down, we just don't see how memorizing a series of dits and dahs is any different than memorizing the current written exams that everyone condemns. Both sound like rote memorization to me. Only the Morse code exams are even more so because you have to memorize them sufficiently well to recite them quickly. Maybe we should put a time limit on the written exams and make you pass them at 5, 13, and 20 QPM (that's questions per minute for the humor impaired.) Then we'd force both portions of the exam to be simply a matter of rote memorization.

Or does copying Morse code at some higher speed grant me knowledge and understanding of the hobby that I don't get any other way? After upgrading, I don't recall feeling any different. I don't operate any differently. So what \*was\* the value of upgrading in terms of changing me as an operator? Or is excellence only defined as the speed at which I recall a sequence of dits and dahs?

Quit yer whining and figure out how to fix the current examination and license structure. Or is that too hard for you? I know, you put your effort into the hobby years ago, and certainly don't need to put any into it now. You paid your dues. (barf)

73,  
Todd  
N9MWB

-----  
Date: Mon, 17 May 1993 20:38:07 GMT  
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!news.ucdavis.edu!othello.ucdavis.edu!  
ez006683@network.UCSD.EDU  
Subject: Type certification  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Hello all,

I'm interested in the requirements for type certification. I know that manufactured transmitters need to be type certified and that I can build my own transcievers with no worry. (except getting it to work) What about kits? If someone sells parts kits and boards do they need to be certified? What if they sell all the boards with components soldered on and only the insertion of a CPU and mounting of tubes is required to get on the air? Aside from transmitters what needs type certification.

Thanks!  
Dan

--  
\*-----\*  
\* Daniel D. Todd           Packet: KC6UUD@WA6RDH.#nocal.ca.usa           \*  
\*                           Internet: DDTODD@ucdavis.edu               \*  
\*                           Snail Mail: 1750 Hanover #102               \*  
\*                           Davis CA 95616                           \*  
\*-----\*  
\*       I do not speak for the University of California....       \*  
\*       and it sure as hell doesn't speak for me!!               \*  
\*-----\*

-----  
Date: Mon, 17 May 93 21:41:35 GMT  
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!headwall.Stanford.EDU!  
nnntp.Stanford.EDU!calvin!paulf@network.UCSD.EDU  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <C75CEv.Ft7@ucdavis.edu>, <Z4go4B1w165w@amanda.jpunix.com>,  
<1t8kjq\$1vu@chnews.intel.com>ord.EDU  
Subject : Re: Morse et cetera...

In article <1t8kjq\$lvu@chnews.intel.com> jlbromley@joshua.intel.com (James Bromley~) writes:

>Robert, Dan's class of license (or that he even has one) is immaterial  
>to the discussion. And the issue isn't fairness of the current licensing  
>scheme, it is the relevance of it to present-day and future amateur  
>radio service requirements. Please address the matter at hand and  
>refrain from these thinly disguised, ad hominem attacks.

Well, it becomes material and relevant when Dan makes it relevant, to wit:

--BEGIN INCLUDED TEXT--

Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.policy  
From: ez006683@othello.ucdavis.edu (Daniel D. Todd)  
Subject: Re: More on no-code  
Message-ID: <C6xM3H.9z8@ucdavis.edu>  
Date: Wed, 12 May 1993 20:54:52 GMT

.  
. .  
.

It must really kill you that I'm part of the same favored group as you.  
Or that there are also extras who want to see the code requirement changed.

.  
. .  
.

--END INCLUDED TEXT--

Looks like a ringing contradiction to me.

--

-Paul Flaherty, N9FZX | "The National Anthem has become The Whine."  
->paulf@Stanford.EDU | -- Charles Sykes, \_A Nation of Victims\_

-----

End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #148

\*\*\*\*\*